

**Remarks****Status of the Claims**

Concurrent with a Request for Continued Examination ("RCE") under 37 CFR § 1.114, this paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed February 27, 2006, in which claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-32, 35, 36, and 41-61 were pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 31, and 61 have been amended.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 31, 32, 36, 41, 44-47, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voyticky (6,637,028 of record) in view of Brodsky (5,809,471 of record). Claims 5, 21-29, 35, and 51-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voyticky and Brodsky, and in further view of Yen et al. (5,991,799 of record). Claims 12, 13, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voyticky and Brodsky, and further in view of Kenner et al. (5,956,716 of record). Claims 18 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voyticky and Brodsky, and further in view of Feinleib (6,637,032 of record). Claims 19, 20, 49, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voyticky and Brodsky as, and further in view of Nishikawa et al. (6,348,932 of record). Claims 30 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voyticky and Brodsky, and further in view of Kenner and Yen.

Examiner Interview Summary

The Applicants express sincere appreciation for the interview granted by Examiners Beliveau and Saltarelli and conducted on May 24, 2006. During the interview, it was agreed that the claim amendments presented herein are sufficient to overcome the cited prior art.

In particular, it was agreed that, because Voyticky requires the creation of a database linking supplemental information with programming times, adding the limitation "without requiring the creation of a specialized database associating supplemental content with programming times" to each of the pending independent claims was sufficient to overcome Voyticky, along with the other cited references.

Likewise, it was agreed that, because Brodsky requires a user to select from a menu of recently stored key words in order to send a request for supplemental content, adding the limitation reciting that the steps subsequent to pushing the remote control button are performed "without further user input" to each of the pending independent claims was sufficient to overcome Brodsky, along with the other cited references.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is patentably distinct over the cited references, alone or in combination. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By 

Kory D. Christensen  
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP  
One Utah Center Suite 1100  
201 S Main Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904  
Telephone: (801) 328-3131  
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**